

## **Design Review Board**

**January 17, 2012**

Present: Peter Schaudt, Pete Anderson, Art Hove, Dan Okoli,

Staff: Gary Brown, Dorothy Steele, Pat Richards, Yemi Falomo

Guests: Darrell Bazzell (lunch meeting); Peter Maternowski (afternoon sessions)

### **Project Review: Memorial Union**

A/E Firms: Uihlein Wilson – Del Wilson; Moody Nolan – Curt Moody, Rex Hagerling;  
JJR – Bill Patek

FP&M Project Manager: Angela Pakes Ahlman

DSF Project Manager: Sam Calvin

Client Representative: Hank Walter, Wendy Von Below, Jacklyn John

CM: The Boldt Company – Jeff Niesen

This is the final presentation of this first phase of the project to the Design Review Board. The architects reviewed changes to the project resulting, in part, from many meetings with stakeholder groups, the university and the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS). The addition of pre-function space to the theater, and in particular the size, scale and extension to the north was of major concern to stakeholder groups.

- The programming of the theater has been adjusted. There has been an increase to the size of some seats which reduced the number of seats in the program, resulting in a corresponding decrease in the size of the lobby/pre-function space.
- Following additional code review it was determined that the brat stand can remain open air instead of being enclosed.
- The floor level of the new addition will match that of the existing lobby instead of stepping down as did the previous design.
- The original exterior corners of the theater lobby are being maintained.
- The canopy of the original theater addition includes a deep flare. The flare is not repeated on the new but the canopy does create a strong horizontal at that level.
- The Hooper addition has defined openings for administrative space, clubhouse, equipment and shop areas. Garage doors and a large louver are needed as shown in the current drawings.
- Exterior stairways have been added on the north of the new theater lobby and east of the existing theater to provide access/exit to the upper level theater terrace. The balcony level of the theater exits to this terrace which means a second exit is required.
- The rhythm of verticals on the new glass theater lobby addition is subtly different from that of the original. It was important to the WHS that the rhythm of the original building not be duplicated exactly. Spandrel panels rather than glass are included at the base.
- The addition and lift at the Stiftskellar have been eliminated with an exterior ramp included to ensure access between levels of the terrace.
- The existing entrance on the southwest corner of the building is being removed with the entrance shifted to the south. WHS requires that an opening be maintained to mark the original location of the three exterior doors. The width of the exterior stair is also to be maintained, even though the only traffic will be

from a single emergency exit passage door. The current design includes a gang of three windows in the original door location to mark the former entrance. The WHS staff have agreed to this concept.

#### Design Review Board Comments

- The prefunction/lobby space is now the correct size and massing.
- Theater wing – consider whether there is a different way for the new addition to meet the flared canopy of the existing theater wing. Can the upper section of glass meet the flare in a different way? Would a recess to create the illusion of a floating roof be helpful?
- The Hooper addition needs to read as a single, unified element. The current variety of openings, although necessary, results in a disparate design. Including a canopy that is at or near the top of the fenestration (not at the roof/terrace level) would quiet down the design and make it more graceful. Indirect lighting in this area would be useful as well. Since the building is designed to the required setback from the lake, it will need to be determined if a canopy would be allowed by the city of Madison. Maneuvering boats on shore in this area needs to be considered as well.
- Landscape needs to be consistent. Curvilinear lines at the lakefront seems appropriate, this just needs to be carried through – removing the right angles at stairs, etc. Small planters in the large civic spaces on the deck above Hoopers don't function well. They should be replaced with solid plinths, where needed to manage grade changes.
- Replacement of the southwest entry with windows needs to be studied. This needs to clearly read as windows to prevent confusion. Suggestions included providing 6/6 lights in the windows to match upper level windows, using the windows as display areas for playbills/posters, and paying careful attention to lighting.
- The DRB agreed this has the potential to be an award winning design and commended the team for reconciling so many issues with multiple constituencies.

## **Project Review: Student Athlete Performance Center**

A/E Firms: VOA Associates – William Ketcham, Mike Siegel; JJR – Brian Peterson, Nathan Novak; BSA – Ian Griffiths

FP&M Project Manager: Ann Hayes

Client Representative: Athletics – Tim Wise; College of Engineering – Connie Brachman

An overview of the project was provided with changes from previous designs highlighted.

- Materials for building and site will be coordinated: masonry piers, steel fencing and the same expression of details and rhythm throughout the projects.
- Paving is shown as exposed aggregate concrete with additional colored bands of exposed aggregate in a 'bar-coding' pattern.
- The plaza lawn west of Engineering Hall is framed by a single row of trees instead of double. This results in more open lawn space.
- Moped parking is shown under the north end addition of the SAPC. This will probably need to be removed to meet fire codes.
- The stadium seating on top of the addition has been eliminated and will not be able to be added back in the future. The mechanical penthouse has been eliminated from the main building and moved to the link building.
- Brick color has been selected to respond to other buildings in the neighborhood. Cast stone will be used.
- The fencing detail is used to enclose the first floor and will follow the arched forms of the openings.

### Design Review Board comments

- Discussion centered on the connection of the curtain wall to the masonry wall on the north addition. The effect is one of slipping the contemporary building behind the masonry. Question is how the spandrel should be treated on the contemporary building and whether the brick reveal at the corner needs to be deeper. Pushing the glass back an additional one foot may strengthen the corner. Connection details will be critical.
- The W-crest shields should include color (red center with a white W) rather than being monochromatic.
- Materials – large scale steel members used on the building should have some brown in the black. Fencing and the fence infill should be black to meet the campus standard. Glass should be as clear as possible.
- DRB questioned why the trees in the central lawn are in planters. Edges can be defined in other ways that would be less costly, investing in soil and trees would be a better use of funds. Raised curbs (6") could be built with precast to match stadium. The lawn area will also be programmable space for events. Connie Brachman from the College of Engineering expressed concern about the number and location of planters in the area north of Lot 17 as well. Attention needs to be paid to eliminating pinch points and creating a safe environment for pedestrians, vehicles, mopeds, bikes, etc.

- The bar code pattern of the plaza and Badger Way raises questions of consistency across campus and will be problematic for maintenance. The plaza needs to be durable and sustainable which means the material is easy to maintain and match when replacing.
- The building is on a great track and will require only minor adjustments. Colors of materials are critical and will be reviewed again with mock-ups.
- Additional work is required on the landscape design. Consultants will need to work out details with Gary Brown and Dan Okoli.

## **Project Review: Softball Practice Facility**

A/E Firm: Potter Lawson – Jim Moravec

Landscape Architecture Firm: Ken Saiki Design – Ken Saiki

FP&M Project Manager: Ann Hayes

Client Representative: Athletics – Tim Wise

The architect provided an overview of the project.

- Intent is to create a new entrance sequence to the project from the east.
- Site analysis broke the site into three zones: a gateway, plaza and courtyard. The plaza area could be a place for fan events with the courtyard reserved for more team based activities. The grade changes from the plaza down to the courtyard. Existing trees will provide a buffer and a soft edge to the tennis courts to the south. Curvilinear, informal lines create separate zones and manage the grade.
- The existing canopy will be retained and directs people in to the stadium.
- The proposed brick color picks up on buildings in the neighborhood. The concrete base and Kalwall details are repeated from the original building.
- A screen planted with vegetation will provide interest and security for the complex.

Design Review Board comments

- The signage included under the existing canopy, at the east entry, is effective. Signage on the building seems to be too much. If possible some of the signage should be eliminated, and at a minimum simplified. The motion “W” on the east face of the building should be lowered slightly.
- Clerestory section repeats the steel framing from the canopy. This would be more effective if it were pulled out away from the entrance.
- Plantings on the southern edge could be loose and informal with a more formal treatment of trees on the north. The southern pattern of evergreens could move into ornamentals in the patio area, which would provide interest at the beginning of the season. Perennial beds should be formed, and raised, to mark the entrance.
- Snow removal needs to be addressed.

## **Project Review: Carson Gulley Commons Renovation**

A/E Firm: KEE Architects – David Ewanowski; Isthmus Architecture – Laura Davis

Landscape Architecture Firm: Ken Saiki Design – Jon Wanta, Stevie Koepf

FP&M Project Manager: Matt Collins

DSF Project Manager: Rex Loker

Client Representative: Paul Evans, Mike Kinderman

This is the first meeting with the Design Review Board. This project will rehabilitate and upgrade the exterior of this historic building, remodel the interior and upgrade mechanical systems, including adding a one-story mechanical space off the south east corner of the building.

- Carson Gulley Commons was constructed in 1926 as part of the Tripp-Adams complex. The walls are stone rubble with cream city brick at the upper level. The tile roof and wood cornice are in good shape. Paint analysis is being done with the intent to return to the original colors.
- Windows are not original, and at the first floor arched windows were replaced with rectangular windows with stucco infill above. New windows will be installed to match the originals with full arched windows reinstalled.
- The exterior stone is generally in good condition with some work required to correct a bulging condition on one wall. Re-pointing of the entire building is not required, but there are some sections of cement mortar to be removed.
- Site planning – there is no existing sidewalk on the south side of the Tripp Circle to facilitate the heavy pedestrian traffic east-west through the site. The grade changes thirty feet from Observatory Drive down to Tripp Circle with about a 10 to 15 foot grade change at the building site. New grading will be required to accommodate entrances and an outdoor patio/gathering space.
- Plantings will be natural to fit with the lakeshore character.
- A one-story mechanical room of approximately 1,300 square feet will be added on top of an existing below-grade addition. The height of the addition will extend up to the existing parapet line. A retaining wall will be added and dumpsters will be consolidated in that area.
- Windows will be introduced in the blind arches on the north side of the building.

### Design Review Board comments

- Need to determine if approach to landscape design will be historic or modern. Historic photos do not reveal much in the way of planting but perhaps plant material could be reminiscent of the 1920'era.
- The mechanical addition has a series of louvers on the south side. As shown they appear too close together. Spacing and proportion should be adjusted. Louvers should be painted to match the brick color rather than being dark brown. If possible the fins could be scaled to approximate the brick height.
- The mechanical room addition could be built out to the existing footprint of the below grade addition.
- Details of the railings and stairs will be critical.
- Drawings need to accurately reflect the existing condition and new design elements.